HUNK



## Note for Nicoli, David

From:

Nicoli, David

Date:

Sat, Apr 9, 1994 10:04 AM

Subject:

Hostile Questions For Campbell

To:

Nicoli, David

Mr Campbell, let me now turn to the issue of the animal self-administration studies that you spoke about in your testimony. Assuming that I am willing to take your word that you did not suppress the publication of the studies, i have some further questions about your research on nicotine.

How many years did Mr. Denoble work for PM? How many years did you have him do research involving nicotine?

Why was PM conducting research on nicotine, in particular the animal studies that Denoble did? Wasn't it in fact because you wanted to see what effect that nicotine had on the central nervous system?

Were you also doing research on nicotine analogs—essentially synthetic nicotine—in order to find a substance that hooked smokers without the various adverse effects that nicotine has, isn't that right?

Did Denoble and his team study other substances like nicotine in the animal self administration studies that they did? What were the substances and what did they find?

I would ask that you submit to this subcommittee all animal studies that Dr. Denoble and his lab conducted. Will you do that?

You do not deny, do you, that nicotine can potentially have adverse effects on a smoker's health? The point of the research Dr Denoble conducted was, at least in part, to develop substitutes for nicotine that had less adverse results on the central nervous system, wasn't it?

Your answers sound a lot to me like you were engaging in research that closely resembles what a pharmaceutical manufacturer does—you were doing studies on substances, from nicotine to its analogs, that no doubt "affect the function or structure of the human body." That mr. Campbell, is one of the definitions of a "drug" under the FDA law. And you now appear before us and have the gall to tell us that PM does not intend to market a drug—nicotine—and that you do not intend to sell a product that affects the function or structure of the human body?

Mr. Campbell, I know that your company has been sued many times by smokers who claim to have been addicted to and suffered a disease from smoking. To your knowlege, has Dr. Denoble ever testified in one of these cases? Tell me what you know about that. Is a transcript available? I would ask that you provide the subcommittee with a copy.

Mr. Campbell, I understand that PM shut down Denobles lab and the research they were conducting. You did that because the lab was producing results that the company thought were damaging, isn't that correct?

I have been told that Denoble's lab was shut down in one day--that it was very abrubpt. Why?

2025769004

Let's go into the publication or lack thereof, of Denobles animal studies. There really is no other word for what you did other than "suppressing" them, is there? He reached results you did not like and that was the real reason for not publishing the study Mr Waxman released at the press conference last week, wasn't it?

You also deny that PM sought or obtained a legal injunction to stop Denoble from publishing the animal studies. In fact, you didn't need to file suit to stop it because a PM lawyer threatened, expressly or implicitly, to sue Denoble, isn't that right? I would ask that you submit to this subcommittee all documents that PM has that is relevant to your lawyers pseaking with Denoble concerning the possbility of him publishhing these studies.

Your Company sued ABC for lying about what your industry does with nicotine. In point of fact, you are lying about what you do with nicotine, and why you use it, and you have been for years!